

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION - DETROIT

In the matter of:

CITY OF DETROIT, MICHIGAN

2014 APR 28 P 2:17
U.S. BANKRUPTCY
E.D. MICHIGAN-DETROIT

Debtor _____/

Case No. 13-53846-swr

Chapter 9

Hon. STEVEN W. RHODES

OBJECTION TO CITY OF DETROIT'S PLAN OF ADJUSTMENT [DOCKET 2708]

FILED BY: KEITH DAVIS

KEITH DAVIS

hereby states his/her/their OBJECTION TO:

CITY OF DETROIT'S PLAN OF ADJUSTMENT

for the following reasons.

1. I / we am/are interested in the Bankruptcy of the City of Detroit because

I AM A RETIREE OF THE SYSTEM AND A CITY OF DETROIT RESIDENT

2. I / we object to the above filing because:

VESTED PENSIONERS SEEM TO LOSE ALL THEIR RIGHTS AND BENEFITS
FURTHER MORE, (SEE ATTACHED)

3. I have/ have not attached additional sheets to explain and establish my position.

I hereby certify that the statements made herein are true and correct under penalty of perjury and contempt of Court under the laws of the United States of America.

Wherefore I/ we request the Court will deny the relief sought in said filing.

Name: KEITH DAVIS

Signature: [Signature]

Address: 15123 FAUST
DETROIT, MICH 48223

Email: KEMETSTRY100@HOTMAIL.COM

Dated:

CourtFile

Both Judge Feikens and Cox ruled that water department employees and retirees pay and benefit packages are paid for in full by the rate payer revenues generated from waters fees. To back this up, none of the bond holders of the water department have been asked to negotiate any cuts in their fees. Thus, no employee present or past should be required to do so either. Be definition should be excluded from these proceedings. Furthermore, the medical benefits should be made whole. I believe Judge Cox stated that to separate the water department from the city is not in it's financial interest. Thus, it could be argued that even those proceedings should be stopped.

Article IX, Section 24 of the Constitution for the State of Michigan

The accrued financial benefits of each pension plan and retirement system of the state and its political subdivisions shall be a contractual obligation thereof which shall not be diminished or impaired thereby.

Though some have argued, that said benefits are contractual obligations, that is the only exclusion given in the state constitution. Thus, it is obvious that the intent was to make pension benefits a different class. Yes a state and thus the court can place the municipality in the debtor class. But not it's pensions and

CourtFile

benefits. Because that was specifically excluded. Moreover, in a similar case in California, the appellate court already ruled that California's constitutional exclusion did apply.

Finally, all revenue generating departments should be investigated for exclusion from these proceedings.